DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 308 929 PS 018 065

AUTHOR Caruso, Joseph J., Ed.; And Others
TITLE Four Year Olds and The Public Schools: Key Issues. Proceedings of a Fairfield Forum (Fairfield, Connecticut, October 18, 1988).
INSTITUTION Fairfield Univ., Conn. Graduate School of Education.
PUB DATE 89
NOTE 44p.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reference Materials - Bibliographies (131)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Annotated Bibliographies; *Cooperation; Day Care; *Models; *Preschool Children; Preschool Education; *Program Development; *Public Schools; School Responsibility; *School Role
IDENTIFIERS Connecticut; *Program Characteristics

ABSTRACT

Forum participants met to assess Connecticut's progress in providing services to 4-year-olds and their families, and to discuss the relationship between young children and public schools. Discussion explored these questions: (1) What are the roles and responsibilities of public schools in supporting 4-year-olds and their families? (2) What do high quality programs for 4-year-olds "look like" in the public schools? (3) How might public schools collaborate with local providers of services to 4-year-olds? (4) What are some implications for public school administrators to keep in mind as they consider establishing programs for 4-year-olds in their schools? and (5) What are some promising practices or models of programs for 4-year-olds at the state, regional, and national levels? Participants ranged from the State Commissioner of Education to kindergarten teachers. Included is an annotated bibliography of 27 citations of related material, and a reference list of 22 citations. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED308929

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FOUR YEAR OLDS and THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Key Issues

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joseph J. Caruso

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FAIRFIELD UNIVERSITY
Graduate School of Education & Allied Professions

PS 018065

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Proceedings

of a

FAIRFIELD FORUM

Four-Year-Olds and the Public Schools

Sponsored By

Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions
Fairfield University
Fairfield, Connecticut
October, 1988

Anthony F. Rotatori, Ph.D.
Dean, Graduate School of Education
and Allied Professions

Editors

Joseph J. Caruso, Ed.D.
Sr. Julianna Poole, Ed.D.
Diane J. Tedick, Ph.D.
Lawrence A. Vitulano, Ph.D.
Jo-Anne R. Wilson, Ed.D.

Published by the
Graduate School of Education
and Allied Professions

Fairfield, Connecticut 06430

1989

Introduction

On October 18, 1988, a group of leading educators were invited to the Fairfield University campus to share their ideas and experiences and to discuss and clarify issues related to the inclusion of four-year olds in public school settings.

Individuals from the State of Connecticut and the region representing state departments of education, public and private schools, and preschools participated in this first in a series of Fairfield Forums on important contemporary issues in education.

The proceedings of this Forum are published here to assist those concerned with supporting four-year-olds and their families in becoming even more informed of issues which need to be considered in planning public school programs for four-year-olds.

Editors

Message From the Dean

The emphasis on public educational services for pre-kindergarten children has increased since the mid-1970s. This development is due to a number of factors. One factor is the growing number of working mothers who need child care services for their pre-kindergarten children. Another factor is the increasing over-representation of minority children living in poverty in our cities and towns who are at risk unless equitable educational opportunities are provided to them. A third factor is the result of research which indicate that the early childhood years are critical determinants of later developmental outcomes.

The federal government has responded to this need by passing legislation that provides funds for programs that educate young children with handicaps as well as children who are at risk due to poverty. More importantly, considerable federal legislation is now being introduced which directly impacts on public educational services for pre-kindergarten children. For example, Education and Labor Chairman Augustus Hawkins (D-CA) has introduced legislation, HR 3, the Child Development and Education Act of 1989. Hawkins' measure expands Head Start programs and supports a range of school-based child care programs. Representative Robert Lagomarsino (R-CA) has filed legislation (HR 635) to establish a demonstration block grant program to increase the quality and availability of child care. This bill has been referred to the Education and Labor Committee.

In the Senate, Christopher Dodd (D-CT) has introduced S. 5, the Act for Better Children. A revised version of the proposal Dodd made during the last Congress, S. 5 would authorize $2.5 billion for child care in FY 1990, mainly for direct aid to low-income families. Families could use the funds for school-based or other care for children up to age 15. Senator Alan Cranston (D-CA) also submitted a child care measure, S. 18, but Dodd's is likely to dominate Senate debate. Cranston's bill would authorize payment to states to assist in improving services for children of working parents. Finally, Senator Edward Kennedy (D-MA) has introduced S. 123 to provide funding to states and local agencies to develop high-quality early childhood development programs for pre-kindergarten children. Kennedy's measure is a refinement of his "Smart Start" legislation introduced in the last session of Congress.

The Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions at Fairfield University is also concerned about public educational services for pre-kindergarten children because we realize how these services benefit the child, the family and society. As such, we are proud to present and disseminate the proceedings of our Forum namely, "Four-Year-Olds and the Public Schools: Key Issues" for your review and consideration.

Anthony J Rotatori

Participants

Robert A. Stepsis, Ph.D.
Academic Vice-President
Fairfield University

Dr. Gerald N. Tirozzi
Commissioner of Education
State of Connecticut
Box 2219
Hartford, CT 06145

Anthony F. Rotatori
Dean, Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions
Fairfield University

Gaelen B. Canning
Director, The Mead School
55 Florence Road
Riverside, CT 06868

Dr. Joseph J. Caruso-Moderator
Associate Professor of Education
Fairfield University

Dr. George Coleman
Kindergarten/Primary Consultant
State Department of Education
Box 2219
Hartford, CT 06490

Dr. G. Faye Day
Associate Dean of Education
Fairfield University

Dr. Larry Dougherty
Superintendent
Fairfield Public Schools
760 Stillson Road
Fairfield, CT 06430

Judith Fishman
Kindergarten Teacher
Stamford Public Schools
128 Rollingwood Drive
Stamford, CT 06430

Judy Hurle
Early Childhood Program
City Hall 302
45 Lyon Terrace
Bridgeport, CT 06604

Dr. Sharon L. Kagan
Associate Director
Bush Center in Child Development & Social Policy
Yale University
New Haven, CT 06520

Dr. Gordon Klopf
Dean Emeritus
Bank Street College of Education
VP, Elementary School Center
70 LaSalle Street
New York, NY 10027

Dr. Carolyn Lester
Kindergarten/Primary Consultant
State Department of Education
PO Box 2219
Hartford, CT 06145

Helen R. Lilienthal, Director
Trinity Parish Nursery School
651 Pequot Avenue
Southport, CT 06490

Helen C. Martin
Principal
Driscoll Elementary School
336 Belden Hill Road
Wilton, CT 06897

Nancy Maynard
Pre-K Teacher
Wallingford Public Schools
Wallingford, CT 0649 2

Marjorie McAllister
Director, Early Childhood Unit
Board of Education
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, NY

Sr. Julianna Poole
Visiting Assistant Professor
of Education
Fairfield University

Jean Rusticy
Early Childhood/Parenting Consultan
State Department of Education
Box 2219
Hartford, CT 06145

Cynthia Schonberg
Supervisor of Special Education
Torrington Public Schools
355 Migeon Avenue
Torrington, CT 0679 0

Dr. Frank Self
Associate Professor
Co-Director, Child Development Cntr
St. Joseph College
1678 Asylum Avenue
West Hartford, CT 06117

Dr. Martin Stader
Associate Professor of Education
Fairfield University

Joy Staples
Early Childhood Specialist
Massachusetts Department of Ed
Greater Springfield Regional
Education Center
Macek Drive
Chicopee, MA 01013

Dr. Diane Tedick
Assistant Professor of Education
Fairfield University

Dr. Lawrence Vitulano
Assistant Professor of Education
Fairfield University
Clinical Director
Greater Bridgeport Children's Servcs
Assistant Clinical Professor
Yale University Child Study Center

Dr. Jo-Anne R. Wilson
Assistant Professor of Education
Fairfield University

FOUR-YEAR-OLDS AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

JOSEPH CARUSO

Welcome to this Forum on "Four-Year-Olds and the Public Schools."

Many school districts in Connecticut are beginning to establish programs for four-year-olds. This development raises a number of key issues about the relationship between young children and the public schools. They include: who should be enrolled in such programs, what the nature of "schooling" should be for this age group, who should provide the experience, where should it take place, and who should pay for it?

We are here tonight to discuss and clarify these and other issues and to assess the progress we are making in the State of Connecticut in terms of providing services to four-year-olds and their families.

Before we start our discussion, I would like to introduce Robert Stepsis who is the Academic Vice-President of Fairfield University. Bob is not an early childhood educator by training; his field is English Literature. However, he is an experienced early childhood educator in practice as he is a parent.

ROBERT STEPSIS

There are several nice parts of my job. One of them is to be able to break bread with people like yourselves and to engage in stimulating conversation with you. My job this evening simply is to welcome you to Fairfield University, to tell you how happy we are to have you here and to wish you good luck in your deliberations.

It is clear that the issue that you are going to debate and inform each other about tonight is a very crucial one. Education is always a serious issue. It's an issue of seriousness certainly from the womb on. There is no point at which education of our young is not ultimately the most precious and important thing we deal with; whether we concern ourselves with higher education in the universities or whether we are dealing with preschool children. So, I wish you enlightenment and Godspeed in your deliberations this evening. Most of all, I want to thank you for coming and to tell you that we value your presence here and what you do in this important realm of education that we share.

JOSEPH CARUSO

Thank you. I would also like you to meet Tony Rotatori who is the Dean of the Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions. This is Tony's second year as Dean of the School of Education. He comes to us via Illinois and Louisiana and has actually come home as he is an alumnus of Fairfield University. Tony has been extremely supportive of this Forum and without his support, we certainly would not be meeting

tonight.

TONY ROTATORI

At Fairfield, we are becoming more and more concerned about what to do as an institution in terms of programming for early childhood education. We have offered early childhood courses for a number of years but I believe that this evening's Forum is a beginning step for Fairfield in terms of becoming more actively involved in early childhood education. We would like the Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions to become a leader in early childhood education in this part of the State.

I do want to also thank Dr. Tirozzi, Commissioner of Education, for being here. I think his presence is important. I know he is very much concerned with early childhood education and as I look at the audience and see people who have come from different parts of the State, from different states and various institutions, it is rewarding to see that you are also interested in coming to Fairfield to talk about these issues. I welcome you and I hope that some positive developments will emerge from this exchange. Thank you.

JOSEPH CARUSO

The purpose of tonight's meeting is threefold: first of all, it is an opportunity for friends, acquaintances and colleagues to come together to share some ideas, insights, experiences, and wisdom about the education of young children. We come to this Forum as a group of highly experienced professionals who view early childhood education from many different vantage points. Some of us are working directly with four-year olds; others are doing research and writing about young children. Still others are directing programs for four-year olds and their families, while some really haven't had much contact with four-year olds; however, we are all here to learn from each other.

Second, as a School of Education, although a small one, we would like, as Tony has said, to take a leadership role in Fairfield County and in the State in general in terms of strengthening our relationships with practitioners , policy-makers and other educators in the State. We really want practitioners to know that we are supportive of their efforts and that we would like to work with them in solving some of the difficult and challenging problems which they face. So we see this Forum , perhaps, as a beginning of a series of forums on important contemporary issues.

Lastly, through the publication which will come about as the result of these proceedings, we hope to contribute, in a modest way, to the goal of assisting educators in becoming better informed of developments in the field.

Our agenda this evening is to explore the following major questions:

1. What are the roles and responsibilities of the public schools in terms of supporting four-year-olds and their families?

2. What do quality programs for four-year-olds look like in the public schools?

3. How might public schools collaborate with local providers of services to four-year-olds?

4. What are some of the implications for public school administrators as they consider establishing programs for four-year-olds in their schools?

5. What are some promising practices or models of programs for four-year-olds at the state, regional and national levels?

Let us begin with Commissioner Tirozzi. Commissioner Tirozzi, when you think of the needs of four-year-olds and their families in Connecticut, what is your vision, your hope for the future in terms of the roles of the State Department of Education and the public schools in providing services to four year olds given: a. the equality of access to programs for four year olds throughout the State; b. the fact that the State Department of Education is really one of six or so state agencies, or offices, which offers services to preschool children; and c. the suspicion and caution people have regarding involvement of the State and of public school systems in the task of educating and caring for four-year-olds?

COMMISSIONER TIROZZI

Before I begin, I just want to make a couple of general comments. First, I want to commend Fairfield University for having this discussion. There is no question that this is a very important and timely topic. Second, I am very impressed with the individuals attending this colloquium. Believe me, I, too, can learn much from you this evening.

In my leadership role as Commissioner of Education, one of my responsibilities is to describe where we are in terms of programs for four-year-olds and their families, our future plans, and some of the critical legislative and political questions that need to be addressed. At the State Department level, we take this important issue very seriously for a number of reasons. I was appointed Commissioner on the same day that "A Nation at Risk" was released. This was an interesting development, because it gave me, as a new Commissioner, an opportunity to really seize a moment in time to do some things.

The State Board challenged us to come up with some kind of a plan that would generate discussions across the State about early childhood education. One of the early recommendations we made in 1983, was that the State should really look seriously at the business of ensuring that we have preschool education taking place in Connecticut for four and three year olds. To move that agenda as quickly as possible, we put together a broad-based committee of very competent, quality individuals: teachers, administrators, and significant others to study

the issue. The report that was ultimately issued by the Committee approximately a year later was one of the better reports, if not the best report that has come out on the subject in terms of what the issues are and where we should be directing our resources (Kagan, 1985).

A key phrase which surfaced in that report over and over again, which really has challenged me personally, is high quality, developmentally appropriate programs. That to me, is the essence of what that report was trying to tell us. No child should be rushed into preschool education, unless and until we can have high quality, developmentally appropriate programs.

Over the years, and I am going to admit something, the Connecticut Commissioner and the State have been recognized for their advocacy of preschool education. I would have to say, though, that in Connecticut, we have the rhetoric, we don't have the commitment. I am going to be very candid. I have not been able to generate the support for the preschool agenda. I think I am beginning to understand why and I will come back to that in just a moment.

As we try to drive the agenda for high quality, developmentally appropriate preschool education, I think a couple of things are happening: We are not doing a good job in terms of educating school superintendents, school-based administrators, and local boards in helping them to understand the significance of high quality, developmentally appropriate pre-school education and the important linkage to the K-12 program. They really see this as a bifurcation, and I am making a general statement. Larry Dougherty, Superintendent of the Fairfield Public Schools is here, and I can name a couple of other superintendents who do understand the relationship. I am talking about administrators, in general. We haven't made the connection for them and I am partly at fault. What we do in the State Department and in higher education to prepare school administrators to understand young children and learning environments that are appropriate for them is one of the key issues.

On the one hand, as administrators, as educators, we tend to look at the family, at the community, and we tend to "blame" them for the problems we have in school. Then we step back and say that we are willing to take the child in our schools as late as possible and forget those formative years. There is something wrong with our thinking on this issue. This attitude has even more serious implications when we consider the problems we have in society; the poverty, the feminization of poverty, and latchkey children, dramatic changes in our family structure. We really have our heads in the sand as a society if we don't understand that we can't wait for these children to enroll.

As we are slowly beginning to move in this State in the direction of preschool education, I find it somewhat contradictory and ironic that I receive letters time and time again from legislators and from constituents who urge us to change the school entry age because they believe that five years is too young. The feeling is that the youngsters are not ready for kindergarten; yet the reality is that the

program is not ready for the youngsters. People don't ask the right questions. I have always been bothered by this wonderful concept we have: if you're four years, eleven months, you're ready; if you're four-years, ten months, twenty-nine days, you are not ready. There is something wrong with that line of thinking but the answer seems to be that many superintendents of schools move the age forward, instead of moving the school entrance age back and changing the program. The kindergarten guide recently published by the State Department should be a great help to schools in designing developmentally appropriate, high quality programs.

One of the reasons we want to drive the agenda in Connecticut has to do with access to preschool education. Equity is a very important issue to me personally, for the State Board, and it should be for the State of Connecticut. Equity is a preschool education issue; equity is an issue at birth. One could argue that equity is a prenatal issue and so, in that context, it is very important for us to drive for high-quality, developmentally appropriate programs and if push comes to shove and we don't have the dollars, I think we should put the dollars where we have the greatest need: Hartford, New Haven, Bridgeport and a few other places. So, equity is very important.

There are a number of mitigating circumstances that are really slowing us down. One is a fiscal consideration. Generally speaking, at the local level, and I think Larry can speak of this and other superintendents if they were here, the focal point at the local level right now is K-12 education. That is the budget that most people look at. If you want to talk about high-quality preschool, or adult education, anything that escapes the K-12 concept, it is very difficult to convince local taxpayers that that's where the dollars should be put. And of course, coming on top of the Educational Enhancement Act and the dramatic increase in teachers' salaries, and the fact that even though the State continues to provide us with a significant share of those funds, local communities are feeling the budget crunch. The fiscal climate in Connecticut is changing as you all know. So, I think there is a fiscal reality and it goes back to what my earlier thought was about certain educators, certain policymakers, not understanding the importance of the preschool initiative.

Another issue that is causing some difficulty, not only in preschool, but even in trying to move the extended day kindergarten program is that of locating adequate space for these programs. What we are seeing in the State is a movement toward the extended-day kindergarten. More and more districts are establishing full day programs. Over the next decade, Connecticut has to confront a fairly significant increase in elementary enrollment and this is going to cause us to look carefully at how we use space. In many districts, even some of our more creative, innovative superintendents, are having a difficult time finding space for these programs. For example, when you consider the equity issue, I don't know how many people know that the Hartford Public School System has approximately 100 portable classrooms; they need buildings.

This does not mean, however, that we cannot make progress toward establishing preschool classes and extended day kindergarten programs. To the extent possible, we should be creative in solving this problem. While we are seeing a slight increase in the elementary enrollment, we are seeing a fairly dramatic decrease in the high school enrollment. What we are going to do in Connecticut, as we have done for years, is to close high schools. We are going to turn them over to local communities, probably for homes for senior citizens, condominiums, or whatever. I have no problem with senior citizens or condominiums, don't misunderstand me. I am suggesting, however, that we look at those facilities in terms of using them for a different purpose, like pre-school education and primary education. Of course, the buildings would have to be renovated.

Another possibility for making maximum use of high schools with significantly declining enrollment is to use empty space, such as a wing of a building for pre-school programs. There is nothing wrong with the notion of pre-school programs in high schools. We had a Head Start program in New Haven in a high school and the Home Economics students played a significant role in helping it to be very successful.

We could also have inter-district programs among the smaller communities, which, ironically enough, would help us to advance the racial balance agenda we have, bringing youngsters together from different communities.

While we are building schools, we have to look at existing facilities, including some neighborhood facilities, to find space for pre-school programs. We have to look at inter-district cooperation. A third approach to solving the space problem that we may try later this year or next year, is to modify the school construction grant program so that if school districts, in fact, do build preschool facilities, they can be reimbursed from the State for the cost of construction and renovation. This is presently not the case.

While I have a fairly high level of frustration regarding the slow progress we are making in establishing programs for four-year-olds in the public schools, at the risk of sounding contradictory, I am also an optimist. I think of the glass as half-filled, not half-empty. When I look at the number of communities interested in the all-day kindergarten approach, when I look at the program we now have with other state agencies working cooperatively with us, I think we are making some progress. We have formed a good coalition with other state agencies; the Governor's cabinet is looking at the poverty issue; everyone on board seems to recognize the importance of early childhood education.

I think we are going to have to work closely with other state agencies and municipalities to pick up their share of the responsibility. Education alone cannot bear this burden. I would have no problem with DHR (Department of Human Resources) or DCYS (Department of Children and Youth Services), or a number of other agencies on board bearing the responsibility, receiving the funding, and working cooperatively with us on behalf of young children and their families.

I am also impressed with Senator Dodd's bill, the ABC bill ("Act for" 1987) and its potential; with Senator Kennedy's Smart-Start legislation ("The Smart 1989); and with Senator Larson who has worked with Ed Zigler (1987) and his concept of schools for the 21st century. We are identifying three models right now: a rural, urban, and suburban preschool day care program, a six-to-six concept. So some things are beginning to happen to the State of Connecticut.

The last point that I would like to make regarding the obstacles to supporting public school programs for four-year-olds deals with the fact that we happen to live in a society where self-gratification, or immediate gratification is of primary importance. People want to see something happen right now. When you talk about high-quality, developmentally appropriate preschool education and try to explain realistically, rationally, and from the perspective of research what it can do for children over time, it is frustrating to deal with decision-makers who want to see immediate results, who don't understand that it may take a number of years before we realize the benefits of early intervention.

Yes, early childhood education and care may appear to be expensive now, but when you look at the reduced future costs in the juvenile justice system, incarceration, the cost savings are astronomical. But many people out there just don't want to invest in the future; they only understand the importance of doing something now.

I am optimistic, however, because I think we are beginning to make some progress on a number of fronts. The fact that the Governor's cabinet is now studying the poverty issue is very important and is related to the development of early childhood programs. I think over the next three to five years, Connecticut may very will be on the verge of actively pursuing the early childhood initiative. I am also optimistic when I talk with representatives from school districts about racial balance and inter-district cooperation. Through the creation of elementary magnet schools, they are addressing these issues. For example, in Hartford and West Hartford, they are talking about building a school together that would have a preschool which would be open from 6:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. and would have open enrollment. I predict that when they open that school in Hartford, they will have a waiting list of 300-400 parents who will want to get their children in, because all of those parents work, for the most part, in Hartford. It is interesting how you can interface a number of these agendas and come up with some very positive results for children.

I want to assure you that the State Department does plan to be a key player in supporting programs for four-year-olds. In response to your last question, there is a concern out there that the public schools have dealt with these children and have not done such a great job and now schools want youngsters at an earlier age. I understand that, but I am not certain that schools alone have failed. For a lot of reasons, we have failed.

Schools are recognized as the social setting of a community. I think the schools have the greatest potential to move the agenda of

serving four-year-olds and their families. I think that this agenda is going to be in the Dark Ages if you try to move it in any other direction without looking at the public schools as a key player. I am not saying the sole player; I am saying a key player.

JOSEPH CARUSO

Thank you Commissioner. I would like to turn the discussion over to the group at this point. Do you have any questions for the Commissioner or comments which you would like to make?

LARRY DOUGHERTY

There are a couple of other issues that affect school systems in terms of the way they respond to the notion of establishing programs for four-year-olds. One is the space issue, which you talked about. Another is that in many communities, there are already very good, private preschool systems already in place. Parents are paying the tuition for their children, and some preschools provide scholarships for children. I suspect that in many communities in this County, 80% of the younger children are already going to preschool. They include those from the most affluent families as well as those from the poorest families, because the poorest children, at least in our district, are supported under Chapter 1. Also, we have a whole component of special education preschool children. There is, however, a cluster of people who really aren't affluent enough to send their children to private programs nor poor enough to qualify for Chapter 1, or other federally funded programs. This is a relatively small percentage of families, approximately 20-25%, at least in the suburban sections of Fairfield County, which is a very different percentage than in Bridgeport.

But one of the factors that we all take into consideration is that we don't want to get into competition with very high-quality, existing preschool programs that are in the private sector. Maybe one avenue that the State needs to look at is how it might provide support for those families who can't get, or don't have, the where-with-all to get those kinds of resources. We do this with Chapter 1; it was part of the Head Start Program back in the old days. It would very cost-effective to support existing programs, they already have staff and curriculum in place. Adding 20% more children to these programs, divided over all the schools in the community, wouldn't run them out of business, which could happen if a school system opened a free program for all four-year-olds that served 100% of the community.

GORDON KLOPF

I seem to recall, after studying the Report (Kagan, 1985), that the less adequate services to four-year-olds and their families in the State are in urban areas where there are large clusters of children from lower socio-economic levels. Is that true?

SHARON LYNN KAGAN

My colleagues will have to help me as the report was completed a

while ago. My recollection is that we found, in fact, that many of our urban areas were fairly well served in comparison to some of the rural areas, largely as a result of the benefits of federal programs, including Head Start and some of the subsidized child care centers. In the State of Connecticut, our subsidized child care has chosen primarily to deliver services through larger centers, and they tend to be located in urban areas. It was one of the rather surprising findings from the report (Kagan, 1985). I think we always tend to think that those urban areas remain grotesquely under-served and certainly they do, but many of our rural areas are under-served as well.

LAWRENCE VITULANO

From a child psychologist's perspective, when we talk about preschool education in the town of Fairfield, we are severely limiting ourselves to mainly private programs for children, which last only three or four hours per day. These are very different programs from all-day programs. Although there are a few private schools such as the Mead School, that have full day programs, there are very few of these programs currently available that serve children who have their parents working all day. It seems that we have to consider how the parents' needs can be met so that the children's needs can be met. In addition, should we expect the private centers to be able to do the parent counseling that needs to be done? Don't we have to separate the briefer high quality programs which are in operation for only two or three hours per day from the demand for high quality longer-day preschool programs? Shouldn't the towns respond to different population needs?

HELEN LILIENTHAL

The largest percentage of children needing care are actually infants. That is where the greatest demand is; a need that is much larger than that of three- or four-year-olds and I don't know how the public schools could deal with infants unless they set up all day centers. They could accomplish this if they have the space. Approximately sixty-three to sixty-eight per cent of parents with children under three are now in the work force.

GALEN CANNING

We certainly have a tremendous demand for our infant program (Mead School) and ours is one of the very few programs available. One of the reasons that we started offering such a program at an independent school was the need to address what Larry Vitulano was talking about; that is, to find out what it means to provide full-day care and educational programs in a six-to-six setting within an existing school system, an existing school that goes up through junior high school. What does it mean to have infants sharing the dining hall with high school students or with junior high school students? And, for us, it has been tremendously exciting, tremendously demanding. I think there are a lot of things that could be happening in those areas, but I can just speak for our school and our experience.

CAROLYN LESTER

One of the things I can think of that would not take money but would be a starting point in trying to understand some of the issues, even some of the misunderstandings that we all have because we don't know each other's programs well enough, is to establish better communication between the public and private sectors. Professionals in the public schools really don't know what is happening in the private sector and vice-versa. Our misconceptions often lead us to asking the wrong questions or having answers that are not accurate.

I am thinking that educators in the public schools should take the initiative and go to day care centers, talk with program staff members, observe the programs, and really try to find out what is already there. This doesn't take money; it takes initiative and a willingness on the part of people.

JOSEPH CARUSO

I don't know if any of you saw the story in Education Week (Gold, 1988) where leaders at the Milwaukee Public Schools have contracted with day care centers for space for the half and full day kindergarten programs for four- and five-year-olds. They are putting public school teachers in the day care centers. It will be interesting to see how this works out in terms of bridging the communication gap between the public and private sectors and solving the space problem.

MARJORIE McALLISTER

In New York City, the Early Childhood Education Council, a local affiliate of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) has members from the day care and public school communities. As a public school teacher, I worked with the day care people for many years and we exchanged information and materials.

Coordination between the public and private sectors must increase since there is a high percentage of children who are dropping out of school, who are failing. These are not the children of parents who are upwardly mobile and who will find a place for their three- or four-year-olds, no matter what the sacrifice. These are children who, for the most part, don't speak English as a first language. Their parents don't know where to go for help; they don't know about the programs or how to have access to them. One of the things we are doing in New York City to solve this problem in high schools is to offer programs for babies and toddlers from nine months to four-years-old and their teen-age mothers in high schools. At present, there are only 400 children in this program but it is a model that should be looked at.

We also would like to establish a high school where we could develop an early childhood training program which would provide teen-age parents with parenting skills and with health and nutrition education.

We need to look at what we are doing with these children who are

potential drop-outs. These are the children we have to reach out to . We are going to have to use every funding stream we possibly can to provide programs for them because no one source has enough money. We are going to have to obtain funding from the state education departments, from Washington, and from the Title 20 people. We will have to tap every funding source and we will have to collaborate. We are now collaborating with the Agency for Child Development (ACD) in Project Giant Step (day care).

Another issue we have to consider is continuity. We have children coming into first grade with no prior school experience. We have second grade testing programs in our state and the principals don't know what programs or experiences these children have had when they were three, four, five and six. It's a sad thing because principals, for the most part, don't know a great deal about early childhood education and how four-year-olds learn.

JOY STAPLES

As I was sitting listening both to the Commissioner and to the rest of you, I felt that you had all been participating in Massachusetts planning meetings for the last four years because we have agonized over many of the issues that have been discussed this evening.

We have been fortunate in that we have a Commissioner who is very supportive of early childhood education. Since 1975, we have served three-and four-year-old special needs children within our state in a unique way. We have six regional specialists, one in each of the regional centers, who serve these children. We became very concerned in 1978/79, as so many children were being placed in isolated settings within the public schools in self-contained classrooms. We also began to look at the number of children who were not in special needs programs but who, five years down the road, were the children who were going to be in trouble in school. Their language base was not sufficient to support them when they got into reading and writing programs, especially given the nature of language instruction in schools.

We began to use a series of grants out of our federal monies to support integrated programs in preschools and tried to bring some of those children into school. We also had some Chapter 1 programs at the time, but our funding and approach were piecemeal and we were very concerned. Some state legislators began to look at the fact that we had a large urban population where youngsters were dropping out of school, oftentimes because they were having babies. People began to be really concerned.

At present, our region has two communities that have the highest teenage pregnancy rates in the state, and when we began to look at those two communities in relationship to the rest of the nation, ratio-wise, we discovered that they were near the top . We began to look at the fact that 25% of the youngsters who lived in the cities, lived below the poverty level and these were children under six years of age. As a result, in 1985, our state legislature passed

Chapter 188, the Education Reform Bill, which included early childhood incentive grant money to serve at-risk children.

As the early childhood specialists in the special education department, we then began to study our roles to determine what they should be. It seemed to make sense for school systems to have an identified early childhood specialist who they could deal with within their regional office. We developed an early childhood education policy that was approved by the Board of Education in 1986, which said that, "Massachusetts was committing itself to expanding the availability of voluntary, public early childhood learning and development programs for children and families regardless of race, ethnic background, gender, religion, place of residence, or handicap." Our goal, by 1992, is to have such programs available in every public school, barring a loss of funding from the state legislature.

At present, we have 83 programs for three-and four-year-olds across the state. We have 60 enhanced kindergartens and 13 extended-day programs in kindergartens, some of which are day care and some of which are full-day programs. We do not have full-day programs in all of our school systems; most of them are half-day programs.

As we did not want to alienate the day care community, our grant mandated that there must be an early childhood advisory council consisting of a principal, a parent of a three or four year old, a teacher of three or four year olds, and people that we call research and referral teams from the Office for Children in the Department of Public Health. They work with parents and they work with private preschools in our state, referring parents to preschool programs or infant-toddler programs and telling them where the openings are. They also work with businesses in helping them to establish preschool programs.

In addition, we mandated that local preschool teachers or directors be represented on the community advisory councils as well as parents and people who are representative of racial, ethnic, and linguistic minorities within that community. We did not want an advisory group going in and telling people what they needed; we wanted a grassroots group. We really viewed these grants as community grants, not grant monies for public schools to spend as they chose.

We are now working with first and second grade teachers to continue the kinds of programming that we have developed at earlier levels. We are looking at changing curriculum, increasing parent involvement, and establishing standards for programs for three-, four-, and five-year-olds. We are encouraging school systems not to enroll children who are currently attending other preschool programs. That would make them automatically ineligible for public school programs. We are not in the business of stealing children from other systems or agencies.

We also asked school systems to do a needs assessment which takes six months to a year to complete. This assessment involves going out and surveying every private preschool in their community; every agency

in their community. They have to determine the number of children in each program, the number on the waiting list, and compare those figures with the number of children in the community. There is no way that private preschools can serve all the children who are in need.

We have studied the problem of locating space for these programs. We have several schools which contract with day care agencies or with other preschool programs for space. We have also established programs for pregnant adolescents in some high schools. We would like to see preschool programs in high schools, in churches, in community libraries and other community buildings, any place where space can be rented within the community. Some funds have been allocated for building renovations. Our educational consultants also work with our School Building and Assistance Bureau to plan for space for early childhood programs in new schools which are being designed.

The last thing, which is probably the thorniest problem that we are dealing with right now, is certification standards for teachers in these particular programs. In the past, for early childhood-special needs programs, we had a Teacher of Young Children With Special Needs certificate. We were very concerned that teachers of older children would be transferred or bumped down to work with three- or four-year-olds. Our state-wide advisory council is now recommending a joint certification which stipulates that you can't teach special education unless you know early childhood regular education. However, as we are in the process of overhauling our whole certification program in our state, our plan is now in abeyance until we determine how it is going to mesh with the total certification plan.

JOSEPH CARUSO

Larry, I know that you had a thought way back.

LARRY DOUGHERTY

I'd like to discuss several issues. One is that as public schools get more involved, certification requirements will become a factor. Costs will rise exponentially because, traditionally, the child care sector has a different salary scale and regulations that differ from public school systems.

If child care comes under the jurisdiction of public schools and teacher certification is required, then, hiring staff and establishing working conditions, will involve collective bargaining. Instead of paying $25,000 a year for a child care worker, salaries will be in the range of $40,000 to $50,000 yearly. Connecticut's teachers' salaries rank fourth in the nation. A 6:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. program for four-year-olds would necessitate two teachers. This could mean, the way caregivers are contracted, an outlay of $84,000 for a program serving about twelve to eighteen children.

From a policy framework, I feel that there are many advantages to looking at alternatives which might be supported by the public sector, but which are not a part of the public sector, so that you don't have

to deal with issues of collective bargaining and contracts.

I know that regulations for day care are very stringent and they specify the number of adults needed for a given number of children. If the same teacher's salary is paid for a ratio of four-to-one for child care, a tremendous financial problem will be created, especially if you are adding infant care.

HELEN LILIENTHAL

I don't know of a single early childhood teacher who works in a nursery school or a day care center who makes $25,000. The top amount is closer to $12,000/13000 for a full-day, full year salary.

FRANK SELF

Larry mentioned something that is a concern of mine. As programs for young children become more common in the public schools, the different levels of regulations currently in effect strike me as inappropriate for teaching young children; for example, stipulations as to the number of hours per school day or requirements that curricular be uniform among schools within a system. It seems to me, that it is easy to be glib about the meaning of developmentally appropriate as if that were a norm. I have yet to find any child who is common; yet, every child seems to be expected to function within a common approach. One of the things most children need from time to time is to be able to be by themselves, to have some privacy, yet privacy doesn't seem to be in our plan. We think about expenses, child-staff ratios, the renovation of classrooms, and hire architectural design teams so that things will be the same -- then we start talking developmentally appropriate. Children aren't the same, school populations aren't the same! When we can truly accept the fact that differences exist and are important to continue to exist and even flourish, then our discussion of developmentally appropriate can truly address the individual child's needs rather than the usual practice of addressing the convenience of the school.

JOSEPH CARUSO

Marjorie, you're a kindergarten teacher, would you care to comment?

MARJORIE MCALLISTER

I think that we are wandering away from the topic we started to talk about and that is four-year-olds. In our program for four-year olds, the early childhood philosophy prevails. It's not wonderful in some instances, but I dread to think where the 13,000 children presently in our program and the 9,000 who took part last summer would be without it. It is marvelous for them and I think that Lynn [Kagan] will bear me out when I say that, in New York City, we have the supervisory personnel to implement a developmentally appropriate

program (McAllister et al., 1986).

Our problem is, that unless you look at a longitudinal perspective, you don't know how to ask the evaluators the right questions. For three years, Ted Chittenden (Bussis, A.M., Chittenden, E.H., 1987) from Educational Testing Service has done research concerning the assessment of children's beginning reading. There are too many people on the college level who teach reading courses which start from the third grade up and who stress remediation. Few professors have taught beginning reading. As colleges begin to strengthen their early childhood programs, I would suggest that they include a reading course which would help teachers understand the reading/writing connection for three and four-year-old children.

I will give you two classic examples-true stories. A five-year-old goes to school, reads a story, and the teacher lets him take the book home. He knows the story inside and out and reads it to his three-year-old sister. His mother overhears him saying: "Don't pay attention to those black marks at the bottom of the page. Those are for people who can't read pictures." This is a child who has a sense of himself as a reader and can really read.

> A teacher asked another five year old: "Do you know how to read?
> He replied, " No, I don't know how to read."
> "Do you know how to write?"
> His very sad, but true reply was, " I used to write when I was little, but now I make A's and B's."

We have to look at our children who are not making it. In New York City, this happens in the fourth grade where we have the Gates Program. At the end of the third grade, if a child is more than two years below level in reading, he's held back. When we took a look at those children who were retained to find out how many of them had good, continuous experiences from preschool to kindergarten to first and second grade, we discovered that the percentage was very small.

We have to encourage principals to look at children as individuals. If they need sand and water and blocks in the first grade, then the children should have them. I don't mean separating them from their peers either. They have got to be with their peers in a regular first grade classroom.

GEORGE COLEMAN

One of the things I am concerned about and question more and more as we ponder the problems of availability, costs, and related issues is whether or not any kind of child care is better than not having any care at all. I am also concerned about the cost of quality care.

I have worked in New York City, Massachusetts, and now I am privileged to work in Connecticut. In most of these states, someone is already paying $100 per week plus for a child in preschool care. This is substantially higher, in most cases, than what it costs to maintain the average student in the public schools between the ages of five and

eighteen. The question is, who pays these costs in systems which are qualitatively different?

I live in Fairfield County where, for the $100/125 that we pay for our four-year-olds , they are attended to by teachers who are significantly trained to bring quality education to them , an education which respects what is developmentally appropriate for each child. I am concerned about the growing number of communities where there are insufficient places to leave children and where the quality of care is such that having a child in a group might not be qualitatively advantageous for that child, particularly when the groups are not organized to provide good experiences for the child. I am concerned about this situation as, in many cases, it creates within a child a certain distaste for school and for group types of care which accompanies the child as he/she enters school. Three- and four-year-olds acquire this dislike of school as a result of caregivers who do not understand them or what is developmentally appropriate for them. Children then become disposed toward not receiving the support in terms of programs and resources which might otherwise benefit them.

So I am concerned. I think that it is going to cost money, but we have to channel that money towards people. Right now, in the Report (Kagan, 1985), there are three indicators which characterize quality centers. One is group size: one is ratio; and the other is trained teachers. I think that we are going to miss the boat until we recognize that a person who is teaching three-or four-year-olds needs to be highly trained. In fact, at the lower age levels, given the fragility of the young child, we probably need people who understand teaching and learning much better than those who are currently in those settings.

JOY STAPLES

I couldn't agree with you more. It becomes a real value issue if you say to people who are working in early childhood education that you will be paid less because you are , in essence, worth less. The value of the work should be a real driving force. At dinner, we were talking about someone who, having been in high school, had seen some problems which needed to be solved. Sometimes you can't solve them in high school--the solution is in the lower grades. I am also really concerned about the accountability issue. Publishers are providing the curriculum and teachers are left feeling powerless. Many times, teachers who have been through teacher-training, who know methods and materials, who can teach a lesson or prepare an activity don't know how to defend what they believe in when they talk to parents. These teachers don't feel valued. They don't have the words to say, "Yes, your child was playing with blocks, but do you know the mathematical concepts your child was learning today while s/he was in the block area?" I think that we need to give teachers the power and the vocabulary to be able to work with parents.

In some communities in my state , we have conducted community forums in which the superintendent of schools, specialists from the State Education Department, teachers who are working in programs for

young children, and parents talk to each other. Two to three hundred parents from small communities of eighteen thousand people come to hear what is being said about early childhood education and care and they begin to understand. We need lots of open houses and demonstrations; for example, we had a resource teacher in one community who, with the aid of a grant, took all of the workbooks that were used and translated every single required activity into a hands-on activity and then showed people how to monitor each one.

Record-keeping is extremely hard. People are really overwhelmed when they walk into a developmental classroom. As they see the children moving about, they think : "How do you know who they are and how can you keep track of where they are and what they are doing?" That's an art, and so, for the last two years, we have been offering workshops across the state to try to give teachers the skills they need to answer those kinds of questions.

A final point which I would like to make is that we can't establish early childhood programs without having the standards which say that these are the developmentally appropriate materials for your classroom. We have a list of these materials and when I get a grant proposal from a community that requests ditto masters and workbooks, they get crossed out. Those kinds of materials cannot be purchased with our grant money. Programs must use developmental hands-on manipulative materials and must also provide inservice training on how to use them.

HELEN MARTIN

One of the issues that we are looking at on the national as well as state level is early childhood education guidelines for administrators. In fact, we have just completed work on a kindergarten curriculum guide to be published by the State Department of Education (Goranson, 1988).

As I look back at the past few years, I see that we have studied our kindergarten programs in Connecticut and have extended the length of the school day. I only regret, now, that our Committee just studied kindergarten because I see the establishment of developmentally appropriate classrooms as a much broader issue. We are really looking at ages four through eight. The curriculum should be a continuum through the primary grades. We have placed a great deal of emphasis on kindergarten, and I am very proud of the guide and the work of the people who contributed to it; however, I am sorry that it says "Kindergarten" on its cover. I wish that it said, "Primary Levels" because everything within that document addresses practices that are appropriate from ages four through eight.

We are now working on a national document in early childhood education that is going to be very similar in design to the Proficiencies for Principals, soon to be published by the NAESP (National Association of Elementary School Principals). This document is going to define the standards for early childhood education for ages four through eight. First of all, we will look at the quality

indicators and define the term, "developmentally appropriate." Then, we will establish criteria for a developmentally appropriate continuu which might help to avoid the establishment of transition or pre-K classes that would not be needed if a developmentally appropriate continuum were in place.

JOSEPH CARUSO

Dr. Stader, did you want to say something about the training of administrators?

MARTIN STADER

The word "accountability" has frightened me from silence to speech. I am listening to this conversation from an administrator's point of view. If I were a principal today, I would feel frightened by this word, "accountability." If I were in Helen Martin's shoes and this air of accountability for preschool programs was hovering about with issues such as the lack of certification, training for staff, and the low salary structure, I would be very concerned. I just don't know how we are going to handle these problems.

JUDITH FISHMAN

I think that administrators of early childhood programs feel responsible for assuring others that they are getting their money's worth. Yet, how can you prove anything when you are looking at four-year-olds for whom you are trying to provide a wonderful, creative, explorative kind of experience? However, at the end of the year, when the children have done all of the things that those of us who are working with them know that they should have been doing, what can we produce that says, " Hey look, here they are, we did something with our money. We spent it wisely." We can't do that. We really can't measure development, and so we keep pushing children into experiences that are inappropriate. We don't have to do that. We could provide experiences that are wholly appropriate for them if we weren't forced all the time by the dollar and by somebody looking over our shoulder saying, "Show me that you did what we paid you to do."

My answer is always, "Come into my room and watch the children. You will see that they are doing childlike things. If you look at them in September and than again in June, you will see children who are growing in childhood experience." But that is not measurable; development is nothing that you can package.

JEAN RUSTICY

Larry, I was interested in your comments about the costs of programs for preschoolers. I just had the opportunity to review the Massachusetts, September 1988 standards for programs serving three- and four-year-olds, and I think we need to look at models that are working with certain funding streams. For instance, in Connecticut, nine state agencies are getting together to administer a comprehensive

interagency, multidisciplinary service delivery systems for developmentally delayed infants and toddlers and their families and the funding is being distributed to several agencies. We need to recognize that special education presently has the most funding for preschool education and it is driving a certain amount of programming. I noticed that in Massachusetts they have a model which puts a certified consultative teacher where a child is receiving services.

JOY STAPLES

Only if it is not in the public school.

JEAN RUSTICY

Exactly. So, I think that there are models both at the federal, state and local levels that bear looking at in terms of trying to implement programs for this age group.

JOSEPH CARUSO

Do we want to spend some time describing developmentally appropriate practices?

HELEN LILIENTHAL

There is no sense in reinventing the wheel. The National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) spent four years working on criteria for accrediting programs for young children and their guidelines are magnificent. The accrediting process involves a self-study whereby teachers evaluate themselves, the administration evaluates teachers and vice-versa, and parents evaluate the program. The application materials are sent to Washington and NAEYC sends validators to the centers. These individuals validate what program members have said about their center. A program can meet accreditation criteria, partially meet, or fail to meet them . A commission decides whether a program will be accredited. The process and guidelines are magnificent. You couldn't find a better model; programs for infants, toddlers, three-year-olds, four-year-olds, and five-year-olds can be evaluated under it (NAEYC, 1984).

LAWRENCE VITULANO

From experience, the only thing that parents care about in terms of accountability is how their children do on readiness tests and then, when their child gets into first grade, they want to know whether he/she is in a high, middle, or low reading group. We need to sit down with parents and help them to understand the test results and reinforce that "It's best to be in the appropriate group." I think that administrators too often react to parental pressure. Parents believe that their children go to a "nice" four year old program or a "nice" nursery school but what they want most are results in two years. The issue of parent education needs to be addressed; parents need to better understand reading instruction and assessment along with child development.

HELEN MARTIN

In just the past year, we are seeing something different happen. Many of our children were kept out of kindergarten by their parents until the age of six because their parents wanted to give them that chance to be in the top reading group in first grade. We keep talking about what we are doing in kindergarten and explaining and modeling appropriate practices for our parents. We've had more five-year-olds come to our kindergarten this year and it is just wonderful.

MARJORIE MCALLISTER

I just want to say that this year the State of New York did something that is dear to the heart of every early childhood teacher. Chapter 1 no longer requires any pre-imposed standardized testing for five-year-olds and six-year-olds. Therefore, we don't give a readiness test, but we use the Structure of Intellect (Meeker, M., 1986) for screening. We are also using a behavioral, developmental checklist for our five-and six-year-olds. There are only 30 items on this inventory. It is very easy for the teacher to administer and the State has accepted it for Chapter 1 requirements. We work with parents to help them to understand these new evaluation procedures.

JOSEPH CARUSO

Lynn, you chaired the committee which wrote the Report on Four-Year-Olds and Their Families. Would you like to comment on the discussion?

SHARON LYNN KAGAN

I do not think there is much that we have discussed tonight that is very different from what other cities, states, and, in fact, the nation are grappling with. The salary issue continues to be oppressive nationally. Child care and early education workers in some states are paid less than certified teachers. The space issue is monumental in certain areas. The testing issue that we've talked about is besieging the nation, as is the whole issue on push-down curriculum.

Continuity between early childhood programs, be they in the public schools and elementary schools, is something we are all working on. There are several points being discussed around the country, however, that I have not heard discussed here. I would like to share those.

There are two critically important things that our field can be proud of: First is the advent of the Act for Better Child Care (ABC) Bill. Although we have lost that legislation resoundingly and although there is great skepticism, even with the 101st Congress considering it, ABC has left a legacy of advocates throughout the nation. The field now is trying to work on moving those advocates so we can take some of the good ideas. We, in Connecticut, are working particularly hard on that, thanks to Jean Rusticy and to other people who have been such incredible stalwarts for early childhood education. There is a

movement toward mobilizing an advocacy arena, and no longer is advocacy a dirty word in the arena of early childhood education.

Secondly, equally strong as the movement toward four-year-olds in schools, is the movement toward family support. By family support in education, we are referring to programs that serve families and children together in a holistic setting. Several examples of this movement are the Missouri Program, the Minnesota Program, and the new Even-Start Legislation that is part of Chapter I, ECIA. The issue of infants being in public schools, which was raised earlier, is an issue that should not concern us. I think Marge was quite right in removing us from that tone of discussion. The early childhood community demonstrates a great deal of concern about how and where we appropriately serve infants; but it is not, at this point in the nation's history, an issue for public schools. Certainly three-year-olds and, more definitely, four-year-olds are an issue.

There are four issues I would like to raise, which have yet to be discussed in depth this evening. First, one of the major concerns is that Early Childhood has been given a herculean task. I call it the Prevention Task. We have alluded to the hoards of demographic problems that face us: drop-out and teen pregnancy rates, etc. And almost exclusively on the basis of the Perry Preschool Project (Berrueta-Clement, J; Schweinhart, L.J.; Barnett, W.S., Epstein, A.S., Weikard, D.P., 1984), people have begun to look toward earlier intervention as a panacea to prevent these problems. I have grave concerns about expecting too much from comparatively modest interventions. The Perry Preschool Program changed lives meticulously and carefully. But it cost $5,000 in 1980 dollars. Compare this to $2950 being spent in 1988 dollars in even one of our most well-funded programs, Project Giant Step. In fact, the Perry Preschool Program had a very intensive home-visitor component that is rarely discussed when people review the literature.

In other words, we in early childhood are collectively functioning under a guise of false expectations, which is not being manifested either in legislative programs or in the provision of dollars on longitudinal evaluations.

We do know how to evaluate. In fact, the state of our empirical work is quite advanced, and, with the exceptions of valid measures of social competence, our evaluation techniques are fairly solid. The problem is clearly a question of having the money to implement the quality programs and evaluation we want.

The second issue, which we have yet to discuss, is the move on the part of legislatures nationally. We now have early childhood legislation in thirty states. The move on the part of legislatures nationally is to be content with what we call " a slot's only approach," where a program is funded at a level that is perceived as adequate by legislators, a cost per child level that covers the basic necessities of providing services to programs. This level of funding allows for pay, staff, transportation in some states, food services, and it may allow for some ancillary services. What it does not allow

for is rich training of people who are in the field. Wnat it does not allow for is building networks among providers so that they can work together. It does nothing to advance the contentious feelings between child care and early education. Until we resolve that, we are going to be groggy. A new report on Head Start has recently come out. It underlines three huge problems that Head Starts across the nation are facing: 1) competition for children; 2) competition for staff; and 3) competition for space. I applaud the report because, for the first time, as far as I know, in our nation's history, we're really beginning to document what is going on in the field. People are grabbing for staff; they are grabbing for space; and the acrimony that is out there is truly being festered dramatically.

We recommended a concept in our Report on Four-Year-Olds a number of years ago: the concept of early childhood councils, which involves collaboration at the local level. Nobody is funding this kind of collaboration, and it doesn't happen unless there is some support to really make it function, either through mandate or through some sort of outside financial support.

The more progressive pieces of legislation are beginning to recognize that we have an eco-system out there that is not functioning, and they are trying to build in supports to that, but to date, few collaboratives have been funded.

The third topic that I haven't heard much discussion about is what we are doing to meet the needs of our culturally and linguistically diverse populations. (Marge alluded to it.) The reality is that in this nation, we don't know what we should be doing in terms of providing appropriate instruction for preschool children who are not English dominant. There is a huge debate on this. The Carnegie Corporation is sponsoring a major meeting next week, in New York, in order to bring together the prominent researchers in the nation to take a look at how we should be educating young children, and at what the language of instruction should be. We have no pedagogy or research on this whatsoever. We are doing a little bit better on multicultural education. I applaud those of you who are working so hard on it, but the truth is that with regard to the language issue, we are shrouded in politics. We have advocates who feel that early childhood instruction should only be in the home language; we have others who feel that it should be only in English. The truth of the matter is, we don't know. We need some solid empirical evidence to move on this issue; to help to guide policy.

The final issue I would like to raise is, as I see it, the critical issue in the field: reconciling what it takes to be a quality provider of services to young children in terms of credentialing. Do providers in this profession need a B.A. or can we move with CDA's (Child Development Associate, 1986). The nation doesn't have an answer to this question. A second question that directly follows the first is: what are we going to have to pay? The issues we are grappling with are on target and the truth is that the field, unfortunately, has not come to good resolutions. We have people in the field who feel you must have a B.A. We have other people in our field who say, " The CDA

is terrific!" Until we resolve this issue, we will be in somewhat of a predicament.

DIANE TEDICK

I want to address the linguistic and cultural diversity issue. There are empirical data from Collier's study (1988), for example, in Fairfax, Virginia, where the school board decided to establish English-only programs because there are, I believe, at least seventy-five different language groups in that area. Collier has found that because they have gone toward an English-only program, the limited-English proficient children are not academically at the level where they should be. Her study seems to be indicating that it will take five to seven years for the non-native speakers of English to reach the academic levels of native speakers of English.

The data that have come out of Canada (e.g., Cummings 1979, 1980; Mackey and Anderson, 1977), the U.S. (e.g., Legarreta, 1979; Rosier and Holm, 1980) and other countries in the world (e.g. Butt and Carter, 1982; Rees and Fitzpatrick, 1981) also indicate that early childhood education should include instruction in the native language.

SHARON LYNN KAGAN

I would appreciate your sharing that information with me and my colleagues in major foundations in America because our review indicates that we don't have data on very young children. We do have it on children who are five-years-old and older. I am clearly aware of the body of literature that exists for older youngsters, but there is hesitancy about applicability for two-, three-, and four-year-old children.

JOY STAPLES

There is a Finnish study, which you may remember and I think that it dealt with young children.

DIANE TEDICK

Yes, you are referring to the study by Toukomaa and Skutnabb-Kangas (1977).

MARJORIE MCALLISTER

I'd like to tell one little story. I'm very interested in hearing more about this. I just want to tell you the story about two Cambodian boys who came to full-day pre-kindergarten. There were four languages spoken in that classroom. The teacher spoke two of them, but could not speak the other two. We didn't have anybody in the building who spoke Cambodian.

The two boys spent their whole pre-kindergarten year having a wonderful time. They were the masters of the sandbox; they did all finger plays; they sang all the songs; they did not speak one word of

English. There was no production of English whatsoever. They went into all-day kindergarten and they started to speak some English. These children now are in the second grade. In the first grade, they were in the so-called "top" reading group. They had no trouble whatsoever.

Many Asian parents are insisting that their children receive instruction in English. We offered bilingual Chinese classes for summer kindergarten and the parents did not want the children to speak Chinese. They said, "The children will succeed in this country with English." Of course, this might be just that community. I am not talking about a national study, but our indications are that in many instances, we cannot provide the language of the family. The children in the New York City speak 63 languages.

SHARON LYNN KAGAN

This exchange indicates the dilemma that exits: different people have different beliefs about how young children should be taught.

DIANE TEDICK

There is a great deal of influence there from the home environment. Parents of some cultural groups are tremendously supportive of English education, whereas some other cultural groups are not supportive of English-only instruction. These differing degrees of parental support for bilingual education vs. English only instruction pose yet another problem.

HELEN LILIENTHAL

I would like to address the second question Lynn raised, "How might schools collaborate with existing providers of services?" I would like to see more interaction between kindergarten teachers and nursery school directors and teachers. I would like to see the kindergarten teachers have a day off to go and visit an early childhood center and see what, in fact, is happening. I would like to see the public school people get together and discuss what they are doing so that they can learn from each other. Then, if some day, we have four-year-olds in schools, there will be a liaison in place.

JOSEPH CARUSO

We are going to have to conclude this discussion shortly. Gordon [Klopf], would you like to say a few words about the project of the Elementary School Center (Shedlin, A., Klopf, G.J., Zaret, E.S., 1988)? I think panel members might be interested in hearing about it.

GORDON KLOPF

The project looks at the school as the center of advocacy for the child. This doesn't necessarily mean providing a six-to-six program twelve months a year, but it does give the school the advocacy responsibility of concern and care for the child as the one agency that

all children come in contact with every day. Though, as we were reminded last week at a conference on children's rights at the United Nations, throughout the world there are millions of children not in any school. There is no advocate for that group of children.

The school that we have in our country today was really built for an entirely different family structure and an entirely different social and community life. Family and social life have changed completely but our school structure is still the same. The church, the temple, the social settlement, the health agency, other social agencies, are almost less involved with children than they were ten, fifteen, twenty years ago. Therefore, we are saying that the school should move into an advocacy/ombudsman role for children.

SHARON LYNN KAGAN

One of the issues that I think concerns early childhood educators in America is the degree to which we are placing a burden on schools that can appropriately be shared by other early childhood providers in communities. In fact, we look at the schools because they are ubiquitous. We look at them because they are universal and they are convenient. When you say "schools," everybody has had experience with them and everyone can conjure up an image of them.

Gerry Tirozzi and I had the pleasure of being with State School Officers when they highlighted early childhood education at their summer institute. I was amazed at their incredible receptivity to using the schools as a focus of advocacy for early childhood services. There were a remarkably receptive bunch and I have to say that, in Connecticut, we are very fortunate to have Gerry Tirozzi as our Commissioner, because there is probably no commissioner more widely associated with early childhood.

However, there is some concern in thinking of schools as the sole supporter of children and families. I think that the early childhood community would feel greater comfort if there were more emphasis on collaboration. I don't think that what schools want is so terribly different from what Head Start people want and from what day care people want, so I would hope we could look collaboratively and let communities, with their various resources and services, work with schools to be partners.

GORDON KLOPF

But who is the initiator? Someone has to do what you are suggesting. Maybe a council can, maybe an agency can, but someone has to!

SHARON LYNN KAGAN

Although we have had very bad success with the ABC legislation, a heart-breaking failure, I think we are going to see some very strong legislative initiatives and I am optimistic. I am hearing that Smart Start is going to pretty much be the realm for the next session of

Congress. I think we are going to see some initiatives in the next session, perhaps initiatives that are going to force us in a collaborative direction.

JOSEPH CARUSO

The Commissioner started tonight. Let's give him the final word!

COMMISSIONER TIROZZI

To pick up on what Lynn said, at the summer institute of the Chief State School Officers, the entire program was devoted to early childhood education with excellent attendance and some of the best presenters in America. At the Chiefs' meeting in November, they will act on a significant position paper, a policy statement on early childhood education, and the way schools should be used in the future. And if you get the Chiefs to agree on this issue when some are elected and some are appointed, it is a significant breakthrough. I have been just so pleasantly pleased with the support and cooperation of that group. Now I am not suggesting that these 50 individuals (actually 55 with the territories) are just going to change everything automatically. But I think it becomes one additional set of players making significant statements, joining students, legislators, governors, early childhood educators and university folks, a strong coalition of individuals across the country. So, I think when that vote is taken in November, it is going to be very supportive on this issue.

SHARON LYNN KAGAN

But Gerry, I think it's very important to note that that document has been very liberal about the role of schools. Liberal in that it is saying that schools are yet one very important force, but not the only important force. It encourages collaboration across various agencies within communities. It is very explicit about the emphasis on cooperation.

COMMISSIONER TIROZZI

My position is that educators alone can't do it, shouldn't do it, and need support from other agencies out there. I think this support is really going to happen, so I think the Chiefs have taken a liberal position on this notion of collaboration.

JOSEPH CARUSO

Well, Commissioner, thank you very much for joining us. I would like to thank all of you for participating and invite you to stay for refreshments and to continue the discussion. Thank you!

Act for better child care services of 1989, S. 5, (1989).

The purpose of this bill is to provide for a Federal program for the improvement of child care by: offering assistance to states to improve the coordination and quality of child care programs; providing assistance to families to pay the full cost of child care services; increasing opportunities for attracting and retaining qualified staff, and lessening the stresses of parents in the labor force who are concerned about the absence of adequate child care.

Biber, B. (1984). Early education and psychological development. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

This book is useful to all who are committed to understanding and serving the early years of childhood, whether they choose to penetrate the roots of the knowledge base or to invest their energies in putting knowledge into practice.

Twelve of the author's original papers which are weighted toward the earlier years of childhood are complemented by twelve companion papers which reflect on what has remained continuous and what has changed.

The book mirrors the author's interest in furthering cross-fertilization of insights between the fields of developmental psychology and experimental forms of education.

Bredekamp, S. (Ed.) (1987). Developmentally appropriate practice in early childhood programs serving children from birth through age 8. Washington, DC: NAEYC

This book represents the early childhood profession's consensus definition of developmentally appropriate practices in early childhood programs. It is intended for use by teachers, administrators, parents, policymakers, and others involved with programs serving young children - birth through age 8 - in schools, centers, and homes. The content reflects the thoughtful suggestions and careful review of hundreds of early childhood professionals.

Bergen, D. (1988). Play as a medium for learning and development: A handbook of theory and practice. Heinemann.

This book is a compilation of the works of leading researchers who view play as an important part of learning. The editor of this book, Doris Bergen, states that the purpose of the book is "to create an integrated, conceptually sound, and relevant book that explains how play acts as a learning medium and that unites play theory, research, and practice to make it useful for those who desire to use play in both traditional and non-traditional educational environments." Among the topics discussed in the book are: stages of play development; play and

the development of language, cognition, and physical/motor development toddlers' play and sex stereotyping; designing play environments, and the computer in the play environment.

Caruso, J.J., & Fawcett, T.M. (1986). Supervision in early childhood education: A developmental perspective. New York: Teachers College Press.

Practitioners who supervise staff in early childhood programs will find this book useful. The authors provide suggestions and guidelines for promoting the personal and professional development of supervisors and staff members, as well as strategies for dealing with staff morale, turnover and diversity.

Clarke-Stewart, A. (1982). Daycare. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

A discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of most popular forms of day care. Included in this book are a summary of the available research data and also some suggestions for the essentials of quality programming.

Coles, R. (1976). Children of crisis: A study of courage and fear. New York: Dell.

This popular study of resiliency in childhood examines the effects of integration on the first Black children to cross racial barriers in Southern schools. Coles reports on the family and community resources which distinguish vulnerable from invulnerable children.

Collier, V. (1988). The effect of age on acquisition of a second language for school. Wheaton, MD: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education

A study was conducted to analyze the length of time required for 1,548 immigrants (representing over 75 native language groups) to become proficient in second language skills for all content areas when schooled only in English. Students who had been mainstreamed after instruction in ESL were tested in the fourth, sixth, eighth, and eleventh grades on reading, language arts, social studies, science, and mathematics using standardized SRA tests. The study explored a range of students beginning with those who began exposure to English at age five and continuing through those beginning at age 15. Length of residence ranged from two to five years. Results showed that students who were eight to twelve years old on arrival were the first to reach norms for native speakers of English (50th percentile) on all content-area tests, doing so within four to five years. Students who were five to seven years old on arrival fell significantly behind the older children in academic achievement, requiring five to eight years to reach the 50th percentile. Students aged 12 to 15 on arrival

experienced the greatest difficulty reaching age and grade norms, requiring six to eight years. This latter finding appears to contradict the generalization that older students whose first language proficiency is better developed acquire a second language for school more rapidly than younger students. However, this finding may be indicating an increasing complexity of language development at each succeeding grade level and the results of taking time away from content-area instruction while acquiring a second language.

Cummins, J. (1979). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. Review of Educational Research, 49, 222-251.

In this paper, Cummins argues that a cognitively and academically beneficial form of bilingualism can be achieved only on the basis of adequately developed first language skills. Two hypotheses support this position. The "developmental interdependence" hypothesis states that the development of competence in a second language is partially a function of the type of competence already developed in the first language at the time when intensive exposure to the second language begins. The "threshold" hypothesis proposes that there may be threshold levels of linguistic competence which a bilingual child must attain both in order to avoid cognitive disadvantages and to allow the potentially beneficial aspects of bilingualism to influence his or her cognitive and academic functioning. These hypotheses are integrated into a model of bilingual education in which educational outcomes are explained as a function of the interaction between background, child input, and educational treatment factors. It is suggested that many evaluations of bilingual education programs have produced uninterpretable data because they have failed to incorporate the possibility of these interactions into their research designs.

Elkind, D. (1981). The hurried child: Growing up too fast too soon. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

A sympathetic cry to return childhood to children. This popular developmental psychologist clearly and thoughtfully describes the hurried child syndrome in contemporary society. As we push to teach children to perform at younger and younger ages, Elkind suggests that we are displacing the essentials of childhood.

Erikson, E. (1963). Childhood and society (2nd ed.). New York: Norton.

This is Erikson's eloquent classic, which presents his psychosocial theory of development, including the adolescent's developmentally appropriate search for identity. In addition, Erikson discusses the differences in many American and other foreign subcultures as they impact on development.

Forman, G.E., & Kuschner, D.S. (1983). The child's construction of knowledge: Piaget for teaching children. Washington, DC: NAEYC.

This text was planned with a commitment to using developmental theory to design curriculum for young children. Two basic goals accompany this commitment: to highlight the constructivism in Piaget's theory of knowledge and to provide a useful pedagogical tool for teaching 2-year-olds, as well as older pre-school children.

The book can be used effectively in child development courses to add practice to theory, as well as in early childhood courses to add theory to practice.

Garvey, C. (1977). Play. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

This book presents the many varieties of children's play. The utility of play in children's development is discussed along with several examples for the reader's pleasure.

Goelman, H., Oberg, A., & Smith, F. (1984) Awakening to Literacy. Heinemann.

This book resulted from a symposium organized by Frank Smith at the University of Victoria in 1982. It is divided into three parts which examine: Literacy and Culture, Learning to Be Literate, and Literacy and Cognition. The book contains the writings of a diverse group of scholars whose work represents a range of methodologies. Among those contributing to the book are: Shirley Brice Heath, Margaret Donaldson, Glenda Bissex, Yetta Goodman, Jerome Brunner, and Suzanne and Ron Scollon.

Harste, J., Woodward, V., & Burke, C. (1984). Language Stories Literacy Lessons. Heinemann

This book is based on the authors' study of 38 3-4 and 5-6 year-old language learners. The authors examine literacy and instructional assumptions and describe children's experiences with language prior to formal schooling. Eight reoccurring patterns in literacy are identified and examined, and through these patterns, children are revealed as effective users of language. This book, which was given the 1987 David H. Russell Research Award by the National Council of Teachers of English, is essential for those wishing to increase their understanding of written language learning.

Holdaway, D. (1979). The foundations of literacy.

This classic is essential for administrators, teachers, parents and others concerned with helping children towards competence in reading and writing. Holdaway describes approaches to literacy from and both historical and contemporary viewpoints. He also details literacy before schooling, developmental and diagnostic teaching,

integrating approaches, and shared-book-experiences.

Kagan, S.L., & Zigler, E.F. (1987). Early schooling: The national debate. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

In this book, a group of scholars and practitioners present their points of view regarding some of the key policy, programmatic, and practice issues about early schooling. Contributors include: Albert Shacker, Bertha D. Campbell, David Elkind, Seymour Sarason, Evelyn K. Moore, Irving E. Siegel, Lillian G. Katz, David P. Weilcart, Douglas R. Powell, and the editors.

Legarreta, D. (1979). Effects of program models on language acquisition by Spanish-speaking children. TESOL Quarterly, 13, 521-534.

The effects of five program models on both the acquisition and maintenance of Spanish and English by native Spanish-speaking kindergarten children were examined. The programs were: (1) traditional kindergarten in English with no English as a second language (ESL) instruction; (2) traditional kindergarten with daily ESL; (3) bilingual kindergarten with the concurrent translation approach (CTA) and no ESL: (4) bilingual kindergarten with the alternative immersion approach and no ESL; and (5) bilingual kindergarten with the CTA and daily ESL. Interaction analysis data indicated that balanced language use (50% Spanish, 50% English) occurred in both CTA groups. Bilingual treatments were found to produce significantly greater gains in English oral comprehension than the traditional all English treatments. The bilingual balanced treatment resulted in the greatest gains in English oral comprehension and overall communicative competence in both languages. ESL instruction was not found to facilitate communicative competence in English, but was thought to facilitate English comprehension in early stages of acquisition.

Lightfoot, S.L. (1978). Worlds apart: Relationships between families and schools. New York: Basic.

The voices of teachers and parents are heard throughout this book. A kaleidoscopic vision of family-school interaction is presented as the light and lens through which different patterns of complex and multidimensional facets of reality are viewed. The book is written to convey both the institutional and structural forces that shape the relations of families and schools and the interpersonal and intrapersonal dimensions that are central to these interactions.

It is particularly significant that, at the conclusion, the voices of children are heard as they point to another vision of family-school interaction - one marked by integration, cohesion, and holism rather than by the over-used model which underscores boundaries, territories, and spheres of influence.

Mackey, W., & Andersson, T. (Eds.) (1977). Bilingualism in early childhood. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

This volume contains papers from a 1971 conference on child language held in Chicago, IL. Six general topics are covered: (1) theoretical and methodological factors of research in bilingualism, bidialectalism, and bilingual education; (2) early language acquisition, as indicated in case studies of preschool children; (3) language learning strategies used by bilingual families; (4) problems of child bilingualism and bidialectalism; (5) the planning of preschool language instruction and curricula directed towards child bilingualism; and (6) bilingual education policy and research.

Newman, J. (1985). The craft of children's writing. Heinemann

This book is written for both teachers and parents! In it Judith Newman explains how children learn to write, and how they increase their awareness of the uses and purposes of written language. Newman includes many samples of children's work and a case study of a six-year-old writer.

Read, M. (1979). How do the preschool children of the Community Education Center perform in the public school system? An evaluation of children's performance and parent participation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 171 367)

A study was conducted with 104 native Spanish-speaking children who attended a bilingual preschool program at the Community Education Center (CEC) in order to determine the children's relative standing in elementary school and the degree of parent participation in school activities. According to the responses on teacher questionnaires, the CEC children were rated as average. Twenty-three percent of the 43 CEC children in primary grades had been retained since they began school, as compared with the 85 percent retention rate of non-CEC Spanish-speaking children in the same school. The degree of parent participation, as determined through teacher questionnaires and home interviews, correlated with ratings of children's standings in the elementary school. It was concluded that although parents appeared to recognize the importance of their involvement in public school activities, they lacked the tools they needed to participate.

Redlinger, W. (1977). Bilingual language development in preschool Mexican-American children. (University Microfilms International No. 77-15337).

Forty-three Mexican-American children were tested for their receptive language dominance in both Spanish and English at approximately age three (Time 1) and later at age four (Time 2). Preschool attendance correlated highly with the shift from Spanish dominance at Time 1 to balanced bilingualism at Time 2. Factors that

were also investigated, but did not appear to play a significant role in the shift, were exposure to television, the presence of both parents in the home, the number of siblings, and the sex of the child.

Rees, O., & Fitzpatrick, F. (1981). Mother tongue and English project. Volumes 1 & 2. University of Bradford, England.

The year-long study compared two groups of native Punjabi-speaking children in British preschools. The control group received instruction in ESL only, while the experimental group received instruction in both Punjabi and English (a half-day each). The results showed that subjects in the experimental group were more proficient in English, happier, and more well-adjusted after a year's time in the preschool than children in the control group.

Rosier, P., & Holm, W. (1980). Rock Point experience: A longitudinal study of a Navajo school program. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 195 363)

The study compared two groups of Navajo students who were monolingual in Navajo upon entering school. The first group was comprised of students in a bilingual program who were taught to read first in Navajo, and then in English in second grade. The second group represented students enrolled in an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) direct method program, who were taught to read in English only. The results showed that the bilingual group produced significantly higher mean scores on the Stanford Achievement Test, the Metropolitan Achievement Test, and the Test of Proficiency in ESL than did the EFL direct method group. The results also provided evidence to suggest that initial instruction in the native language may be cumulative; that is, as time goes on (especially beyond grade three) the bilingual students' scores converged closer to the national norm and farther away from the scores of the EFL students.

Singer, D.G. & Revenson, T.A. (1978). How a child thinks: A Piaget primer. New York: New American Library.

Piaget made readable. This excellent introduction to Piaget's cognitive theory of development presents most of his essential concepts in a delightfully clear style. The authors also add their own recommendations for teachers and parents of young children.

Toukomaa, P., & Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1977). The intensive teaching of the mother tongue to migrant children of preschool age and children in the lower level of comprehensive school. The Finnish National Commission for UNESCO, Helsinki.

The study was conducted with approximately 700 Finnish children, living in two Swedish communities. In one community the children did

not receive any instruction in Finnish, their native language, and in the other, some children received most of their instruction in Swedish and studied Finnish two hours per week, whereas others attended experimental classes in which the vast amount of instruction was given in Finnish, and where Swedish was studied as a subject. The children were administered nonverbal intelligence tests and different language tests in both Finnish and Swedish. The children achieved average scores on the nonverbal tests. Results showed that, in general, children produced low scores in Finnish. Their performance in Swedish was even poorer, the lowest scores in Swedish being those made by children who had received all of their instruction in Swedish. The experimental subjects' scores were found to be even lower than the average scores of Finnish children in Finland, suggesting that the experimental subjects' Finnish was rather poor when they began school in Sweden. Although competence in Swedish correlated with the time spent in Sweden, even after seven years the Finnish children in Sweden had not reached the average competence of Swedish children in Swedish. All results indicated that a strong development of the native language Finnish, facilitated acquisition of the second language, Swedish.

References

Act for better child care services of 1989, S. 5, 1989.

Berrueta, C.J., Schweinhart, L.J., Barnett, W.S., Epstein, A.S., and Weikard, D.P. (1984). Changed lives: The effects of the Perry preschool program on youths through age nineteen. Ypsilanti, MI: The High Scope Press.

Bussis, A.M., Chittenden, E.H. (1987, March). Research currents: What the reading tests neglect. Language Arts, 64, 302-308.

Butt, B. & Carter, R. (1982)., Bilingual project with under fives at Hounslow Health Infants School, Hounslow, England.

Child Development Associate, National Credentialing Program (1986). Preschool caregivers in center-based programs. Washington, DC: Council for Early Childhood Professional Recognition.

Collier, V. (1988). The effect of age on acquisition of a second language for school. National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. Wheaton, Maryland.

Cummins, J. (1979). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. Review of Educational Research, 49, 222-251.

Cummins, J. (1980). The cross-lingual dimensions of language proficiency: Implications for bilingual education and the optimal age issue. TESOL Quarterly, 14, 175-188.

Gold, D.L. (October 12, 1988). Contracts for kindergarten: Milwaukee schools launch "prototype." Education Week, Vol. VIII, No. 6, p. 1 and 19.

Goranson, D.G., Jr. (Ed.) (1986). A guide to program development for kindergarten, part 1 and 2. Hartford, CT: Connecticut State Department of Education.

Kagan, S.L. (Ed.) (1985, April). Four year olds: Who's responsible? A report presented to the Connecticut Board of Education by the Committee on Four Year Olds, Their Families, and the Public Schools.

Legarreta, D. (1979). Effects of program models on language acquisition by Spanish-speaking children. TESOL Quarterly, 13, 521-534.

Mackey, W. & Andersson, T. (Eds.) (1977). Bilingualism in early childhood. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

McAllister, M., et al. (1986). Three, four, open the door: A handbook for teachers. New York: Board of Education.

Meeker, M. (1986). Screening for learning and thinking abilities: K-3. Vida, OR: SOI Systems.

NAEYC (1984). Accreditation criteria and procedures of the National Academy of Early Childhood Programs. Washington, DC: NAEYC.

Rees, O. & Fitzpatrick, F. (1981). Mother tongue and English project. Vols. 1 & 2, University of Bradford, England. (Punjabi/English).

Rosier, P. & Holm, W. (1980). Rock Point Experience: A longitudinal study of a Navajo school program. Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, DC.

Shedlin, A., Klopf, G.J., Zaret, E.S. (1988). The school as locus of advocacy for all children. New York: Elementary School Center.

The smart start: The community collaborative for childhood development act of 1989. S. 123, (1989).

Toukomaa, P. & Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1977). The intensive teaching of the mother tongue to migrant children of preschool age and children in the lower level of comprehensive school. The Finnish National Commission for UNESCO, Helsinki.

Zigler, E.F. (1987, September). A solution to the nation's child care crisis: The school of the twenty-first century. Paper delivered at the Bush Center in Child Development and Social Policy, Yale University, New Haven, CT.

Faculty, Graduate School of Education & Allied Professions, 1988-89

Robert S. Avery, Lecturer in Education
Janine M. Bernard, Associate Professor of Education
Ann M. Black, Lecturer in Education
Joseph J. Caruso, Associate Professor of Education
Karen Connolly, Lecturer in Education
Anthony Costa, Assistant Professor of Education
William L. Curnin, Lecturer in Education
Georgia Payetta Day, Associate Professor of Education; Associate Dean
Margaret C. Deignan, Associate Professor of Education
Nancy Ellis, Assistant Professor of Education
Thomas J. Foran, Lecturer in Education
Paul J. Gaus, Lecturer in Education
Daniel Geller, Associate Professor of Education
Harold Hackney, Professor of Education
Richard P. Hagemen, Jr., Lecturer in Education
Ibrahim M. Hefzallah, Professor of Education
James Honeycutt, Lecturer in Education
Martin A. Lang, Professor of Religious Studies
Francis W. Lewis, S.J., Professor of Education
W. Paul Maloney, Lecturer in Education
Jean-Henry Mathurin, Lecturer in Education
Brian Merry, Lecturer in Education
Frederick Mis, Lecturer in Education
Edward Montignino, Lecturer in Education
Sr. Julianna Poole, Assistant Professor of Education
Rona Preli, Assistant Professor of Education
Anthony F. Rotatori, Professor of Education, Dean
Jerome J. Schiller, Professor of Psychology and Education
John J. Schurdak, Associate Professor of Education Research and Development
Martin A. Stader, Associate Professor of Education
Diane J. Tedick, Assistant Professor of Education
Winston Tellis, Lecturer in Education
Linda L. Terry, Assistant Professor of Education
Alexander Tolor, Professor of Psychology
Louis M. Triozzi, Lecturer in Education
Lawrence A. Vitulano, Lecturer in Education
Marion S. Walsh, Lecturer in Education
Jo-Anne R. Wilson, Assistant Professor of Education